

DRAWING AMENDMENTS

The attached sheets of drawings include corrected Figures 1 and 2 and changes to Figure 3. These sheets, which include Figure 1, 2, and 3, replace the original sheets 1, 2, and 3. In Figure 3, the word “digitised” in the phrase “digitized audio data” output from the structured sentence block 302 has been changed to “digitized”.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 9-12, 15-17, 26-29, 32-34, and 48-50 are presented for consideration. Claims 9, 15, 26, and 32 are independent. Claims 10-12 and 29 have been amended and claims 1-8, 13-14, 18-25, 30-31, and 35-47 have been canceled. Claims 48-50 have been added. The Drawings have been amended. The Specification has been amended. It is believed that these changes introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

In paragraph 1 the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings stating that Figures 1 and 2 are sloppy. By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have provided Replacement Sheets for Figures 1 and 2 to accommodate the Examiner's objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the objection to the Drawings.

Also, by the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended Figure 3 as described above. Support for these changes can be found in paragraph [0024] of Applicants' Specification.

Objection to the Specification

In paragraph 2 the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification stating that the term "voice recognition" is misused for what nowadays is called "speech recognition". By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have amended the Specification to accommodate the Examiner's objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the objection to the Specification.

Objection to Claims 8 and 23

In paragraph 2 the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 8 and 23 stating that the term "voice recognition" is misused for what nowadays is called "speech recognition." Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to object to independent claim 6 rather than dependent claim 8. By the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have canceled claims 6 and 23

to render the Examiner's objection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the objection to the claims 6 and 23.

Rejection of Claims 13-14, 30-31, and 40-41 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 13-14, 30-31, and 40-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,615,296 to Stanford et al. (hereinafter "Stanford"). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a reference. (MPEP §2131 *citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id. citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe claims 13-14, 30-31, and 40-41 to be patentable as written, claims 13-14, 30-31, and 40-41 have been canceled. Such cancellation renders the rejection of them moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 13-14, 30-31, and 40-41.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5, 18, 22, 35-39, 44, and 46 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5, 18, 22, 35-39, 44, and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0072914A1 to Alshawi (hereinafter "Alshawi"). In paragraph 10, the Examiner rejects claims 45 and 47. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, an Examiner must show three things: (1) that there is some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention, (2) that there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the references teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. (MPEP §2143) Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe claims 1, 5, 18, 22, 35-39, 44, and 46 to be patentable as written, claims 1, 5, 18, 22, 35-39, 44, and 46 have been canceled. Such cancellation renders

the rejection of them moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 1, 5, 18, 22, 35-39, 44, and 46.

Rejection of Claims 2-4 and 19-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford in view of Alshawhi in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,758,319 to Knittle (hereinafter “Knittle”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe claims 2-4 and 19-21 to be patentable as written, claims 2-4 and 19-21 have been canceled. Such cancellation renders the rejection of them moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 2-4 and 19-21.

Rejection of Claims 6-8 and 23-25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 6-8 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stanford in view Knittle. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe claims 6-8 and 23-25 to be patentable as written, claims 6-8 and 23-25 have been canceled. Such cancellation renders the rejection of them moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 6-8 and 23-25.

Rejection of Claims 9-12 and 26-29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 20 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-12 and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,385,579 to Padmanabhan et al. (hereinafter “Padmanabhan”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,983,187 to Haddock et al (hereinafter “Haddock”) in further view of Stanford. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, an Examiner must show three things: (1) that there is some suggestion or motivation to modify a reference or combine reference teachings to arrive at the claimed invention, (2) that there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and (3) that the

references teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. MPEP §2143. The motivation to combine references must be found in the references themselves. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Padmanabhan appears to be directed to speech recognition in an acoustically confusing environment such as during conversational speech. The problem addressed in Padmanabhan is that speech recognition systems can be prone to confuse certain words or phrases such as “going to” due to variations in how those words are pronounced, especially at boundaries between the adjacent words, resulting in pronunciations such as “gonna” for example, where the consecutive words are run together. The solution proposed by Padmanabhan is to replace consecutive word pairs in the training corpus with compound words so that when the compound word is spoken it will be recognized.

Haddock appears to be directed to a speech recognition system that uses silences in recorded speech to indicate that a keyword may have just been spoken. The challenge faced in Haddock was organizing and storing recorded speech.

In the Office Action, the Examiner combines Padmanabhan and Haddock and uses the combination as a basis for an obviousness rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that such a combination is inappropriate because neither reference provides a motivation for their combination. For example, they are extremely different challenges, namely solving acoustic confusion (Padmanabhan) and organizing recorded speech (Haddock). Padmanabhan provides no reason why a person of ordinary skill would look to recorded speech organization and storage technologies to solve issues of acoustic confusion. Likewise, Haddock offers no clue that its organizing and storage challenges could be may find a solution in the pronunciation recognition technology areas. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner may not base an obviousness rejection on such an improper combination of references.

Stanford fails to make up for this deficiency in that without Padmanabhan and Haddock, the Examiner has failed to show at least some of the elements of the claimed invention. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to make a

prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claims 9-12 and 26-29 and that claims 9-12 and 26-29 are thus patentable over Padmanabhan in view of Haddock in further view of Stanford. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 9-12 and 26-29.

Rejection of Claims 15-16 and 32-33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 24 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15-16 and 32-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,434,529 to Walker et al. (hereinafter "Walker"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe claims 15-16 and 32-33 to be patentable as written, claims 15-16 and 32-33 have been canceled. Such cancellation renders the rejection of them moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 15-16 and 32-33.

Rejection of Claims 17 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 26 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Stanford. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe claims 17 and 34 to be patentable as written, claims 17 and 34 have been canceled. Such cancellation renders the rejection of them moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 17 and 34.

Rejection of Claims 42-43 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 27 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 42-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in view of Stanford. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Although Applicants believe claims 42-43 to be patentable as written, claims 42-43 have been canceled. Such cancellation renders the rejection of them moot. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 42-43.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all grounds for rejection have been properly traversed or accommodated, and that the application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 2/4/2005 Jan Little-Washington
Jan Little-Washington
Reg. No.: 41,181
(206) 292-8600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL (if applicable)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

on February 4, 2005
Date of Deposit

Adrian Villarreal
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence
[Signature] February 4, 2005
Signature Date